

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application for the Examiner's review and consideration. Claims 14 and 16 have been amended to change the dependencies of the claims. These amendments add no new matter, and entry is requested. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating allowable claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 14, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,238,587 to Smith *et al.* ("Smith-587") or U.S. Patent No. 5,658,651 to Smith *et al.* ("Smith-651"). Applicants respectfully obviate the rejection.

On page 2 of the Office Action, it is alleged that the present invention is anticipated by either Smith-651 or Smith-587. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 14 and 16, are now dependant on claim 1, not rejected by the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims and their dependant claims are not anticipated by Smith-587 or Smith-651. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Smith-587 or Smith-651 in view of Sidoti *et al.* ("Sidoti"). Applicants respectfully traverse and obviate the rejection.

On page 3 of the Office Action, it is alleged that it would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the kit of Smith to include instructions as taught by Sidoti, for the purposes of ensuring proper use of the product and avoiding injury to the user. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 14 and 16, are now dependant on claim 1, not rejected by the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims and their dependant claims are not obvious over Smith-587 or Smith-651 in view of Sidoti. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

With regard to all claims not specifically mentioned, these are believed to be allowable not only in view of their dependency on their respective base claims and any intervening claims, but also for the totality of features recited therein.

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner disagree, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants to arrange for a telephonic interview in an effort to expedite the prosecution of this matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and accompanying remarks, reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested. No fee is believed to be due for the amendments herein. Should any fee be required, please charge such fee to Procter & Gamble Deposit Account No. 16-2480.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark A. Charles

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 51,547

Tel. No. (513) 627-4229

Dated: September 7, 2004

Customer Number: 27752